UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Deep Roots of Wrath - *Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.*

Survival Towns - - *Manfred A. Carter*

An Experiment in Purposeful Communication - - *Charles William Phillips*

The Most Unforgettable Character I Have Known - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Ethics and Two Nihilisms - *Victor S. Yarros*

Should Restrictive Covenants Be Prohibited by Law? - - - *Homer A. Jack*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 9

Chicago, November, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878
(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50
Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Manfred A. Carter: Author of *Private Smith's Return* and other poetry.

John H. Hershey: Editor of the Quarterly, *Latin American Thought.*

Leo Hirsch: Free Lance Writer and Lecturer.

Homer A. Jack: Executive Secretary of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Charles William Phillips: Director of the Visual Service Department, National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Liberty Unlimited—CURTIS W. REESE 115

ARTICLES—
Deep Roots of Wrath—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 116
Survival Towns—MANFRED A. CARTER 118
An Experiment in Purposeful Communication—CHARLES WILLIAM PHILLIPS 119
The Most Unforgettable Character I Have Known—LEO HIRSCH 121
Ethics and Two Nihilisms—VICTOR S. YARROS 122
Voices of Latin America—IX. Samuel Ramos: Mexican Humanist—JOHN H. HERSHEY 124
Should Restrictive Covenants Be Prohibited by Law?—HOMER A. JACK 125

THE STUDY TABLE—
Christianity Against Caste—JAMES M. YARD 127

CORRESPONDENCE—
Resolutions Are Not Enough—MAY STRANATHAN 127

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 128

THE FIELD—
A Resolution on Permanent Fair Employment Practices Committees—AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION 114

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Resolution on Permanent Fair Employment Practices Committees

Adopted by the 121st Annual Meeting of the

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

Held in Boston, Massachusetts May 23, 1946

WHEREAS: For several years the American Unitarian Association has gone on record affirming and implementing our historic tradition of the struggle for the rights and liberties of all racial minorities, and, in 1944, recorded its support of the "establishment by act of Congress of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee"; and

WHEREAS: The past year has once again seen the United States Senate, through its failure to invoke the cloture rule, permit the use of the filibuster by a minority to defeat the will of the people;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED: That the American Unitarian Association, assembled in its 121st Annual Meeting, urges Congress to make prompter and more frequent use of the cloture rule; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the American Unitarian Association again declares its support of pending legislation to establish by act of Congress a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED: That the American Unitarian Association urges all members of our fellowship to support state legislation designed to establish state Fair Employment Practices Committees, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and the Chairman of the House Committee on Labor.

UNITY

Volume CXXXII NOVEMBER, 1946 No. 9

LIBERTY UNLIMITED

It is a pity that Unitarians must periodically waste precious time and energy in the reconsideration of their position on an issue which Unitarian history has determined and the genius of the Unitarian movement makes imperative. The Unitarian position is that of liberty unlimited by external compulsions, and there should be no indecision on this issue. Some years ago when the Humanist-Theist controversy was creating a furore, Howard N. Brown, then minister of King's Chapel and Chairman of the Board of the *Christian Register,* expressed the true Unitarian spirit when he said: "We must not interfere with the liberty of the brethren." That is a statement of the dominant Unitarian position through the centuries, and there should be no question about its applicability today. I should like to warn Socialists, pacifists, and others among us who deviate from the conventional norms that they are tampering with dynamite when they associate themselves with reactionaries and Red-baiters in efforts to draw lines demarking the boundaries of liberty. In other days and on other issues their liberties would be jeopardized if limiting precedents were once established.

We have no reason to be concerned about the extra-curricular activities of denominational officials so long as such activities do not interfere with the time, energy, and attention necessary to fulfill faithfully the duties assigned to them. For my own part I have not for many years been willing to sponsor meetings, groups, and movements that I believe to be dominated by the Communists, but if any of our officials, ministers, or members want to do so, that is their privilege; just as it is the privilege of others among us to sponsor Chambers of Commerce and Manufacturers' Associations, or to expound laissez-faire economics. Our only concern in judging extra-curricular activities should be whether they absorb time, energy, and interest to such an extent that duties which officials are selected to perform are neglected. This has nothing to do with the content of the extra-curricular activities. It is conceivable that a Unitarian official could be so interested in study and research in Unitarian history that he might properly be dismissed from a position for neglecting the functions of his office.

It is not valid to say that a denominational official should be disqualified because some of his ideas are too markedly in conflict with the prevailing ideas of a given section of the country or of the whole country. Unitarianism as such is usually in conflict with the prevailing ideas of most communities. Our job is to convert and not to conform. Nor is it valid to say that liberty unlimited opens the door for the entrance of Jesuits, advocates of dictatorship, and avowed enemies of liberty, and that such persons must be included as proper constituents of a free church. Such argument misses the real meaning of freedom. A free church is a fellowship of the free, not a fellowship of the intolerant. Liberty not only may but should protect itself from the intolerant.

If one could imagine a trial of a Unitarian on a charge of heresy, there would be only one question in order. That question would not have to do with what the alleged heretic believed about the nature of the universe or the nature of society. The one question should be: Do you or do you not believe in interfering with the liberty of the brethren?

Curtis W. Reese.

Deep Roots of Wrath

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Science, unlike theology, keeps constantly going forward, publishing its new hypotheses and experimental conclusions day by day. One of the more recently advanced theories of science concerns itself with phosphorescence, the rare and wonderful activity of a substance which can absorb and store ultra-violet and other light rays and subsequently emit them as visible light —visible in the dark—over a period as brief as a millionth of a second or as long as hundreds of hours.

It is not the theory that has a "moral" for us however, but this business of phosphorescence itself. For years and years our economic system has been absorbing and storing up "ultra-violet and other light rays" of injustice, inequity, resentment, insecurity, tediousness, and so forth, and is now, in the darkness of abysmal misunderstanding and passionate ignorance, emitting the hot light of bitter conflict.

Many are reeling badly in the glare of that light. They are confused and afraid. What is more dangerous, they are substituting shallow prejudice for knowledge.

Such a deadly serious matter as the present era of industrial conflict does not exemplify, or in any way resemble, the theologian's notion of an uncaused cause. In the realm of the natural world all have come to accept pretty generally the simple progression of cause and effect. But can we speak so boldly of universal prowess in the psychological areas of human interrelationships? Emerson used to say that while weak men believe in luck, strong men believe in cause and effect. It is certainly a matter of deep concern that so few in the professional, white-collar and entrepreneur classes of America are exhibiting the characteristics of "strong men" today with reference to the militancy of industrial wage earners. Organized and unorganized working people are restive and resentful under the stress of sharply real and distinct causes. The strikes, because of which many white-collar Americans are ready to surrender to industrial Fascism, are not the outgrowths of seed strewn on rocky ground where there is not much earth, and where because there is no deepness of earth, the shoots have no root and wither away. Not at all. The strikes are but the occasional angry buds and blossoms appearing upon a strong stalk that has deep roots of wrath.

The prevailing ugly mood of the average American bourgeois—based as it is upon a mass of misunderstanding, fed as it is by the deliberate falsification of an overwhelming majority of our press and radio facilities, given "divine" sanction as it is by the subtle annihilation tactics of such acclaimed oracles as *Life, Time* and *Readers' Digest*—is one of the most threatening clouds on the horizon. Anti-labor sentiment among the middle classes has reached such angry proportions as to make an appeal to reason most difficult. And yet, if such an appeal is not made, if the wellsprings of reason do not bring forth the healing waters of understanding, this mood of anger could become one of repression, and the end of freedom in America would be in sight. Surely, this is something few desire, regardless of present indignation and bad temper.

What, then, of these roots of wrath? How shall we assess the soil of our economic life, coming to understand its spongy ability to suck down the seeds of industrial strife and root the conflicts so deeply?

Lois MacDonald, economics professor at New York University and author of the excellent study "Labor Problems and the American Scene," has given us this cogent summary of first principles for understanding labor problems:

> Wage earners are a part of the organization of modern economic society. Their work is performed as a part of the productive system, in a framework underpinned by the economic, social, and political philosophies of modern capitalism. The problems which emerge as especially characteristic of the laboring class are part of the larger range of problems characteristic of a large scale, highly integrated, and mechanized industrial system. The attitudes and modes of behavior adopted by wage earners are not derived from any occult source, but flow from their functional relationship to their jobs, their fellow workers, their employers, their families, and the communities in which they live, which in turn rest upon the fundamental basis of the wage relationship.

What are some of the outstanding forces within capitalist culture which come to bear upon the wage earner, and what are the results of these forces in terms of his mental habits, life outlook, and conscious actions?

The one inducement *without* which the capitalist economic system could not endure is that of making money. The conquest of the Western World by the business mentality, and the resulting acceptance of money as the pre-eminent standard of values, not only for material subsistence, but for psychological gratifications as well, is so universal as to warrant this being called a "businessman's civilization." It seems rather obvious that the wage earners' attitudes are to be molded by this prevailing pressure.

It would be most insensible for workmen to accept any other dictum than that they, as salesmen of their product, labor, should attempt to sell it at the highest possible price. Whenever workmen are confronted with an opportunity and technique for increasing the money value of their labor it would be contrary to the whole dynamic of capitalism for them to ignore such an opportunity.

The frustration of the worker derives not from his inability to adopt the capitalist mentality of pecuniary values, but from the crushing incompetence of his position in making those values work to his benefit. For he finds that it is the businessman, the so-called producer of goods for profit, who is protected and stabilized by the institutions of private ownership of property and freedom of contract. He, who is the seller only of his labor, may or may not be protected by government or charity, when what the businessman calls "a scarcity of buyers' dollars and a surplus of goods" brings the moral and spiritual, as well as the material, degradations of economic depression to him and his family.

All this has significance only as we view it against a backdrop of the machine process of mass production. The words *machine process* are used with particular forethought that aims to express a principle of action that may start with a simple mechanical device but proceed from there all the way to corporation control of public information and similar control of portions of a supposedly democratic and representative government.

It was in the course of this machine process that the workman, who under a handicraft system had been relatively free and creative in his work, became the regimented automaton of the production line. In this process, the wage earner became a man without an economic personality, just another face in the great masses of urban-centered industrial workers, a non-owning nonentity completely subject to the whim and caprice of the businessman's economic cycle.

What we have, then, is this mass of non-owning economic nonentities crowded into the cultural alleys of a social system dominated by businessmen, who consider protection of their property and pecuniary opportunities to be the fundamental and primary aim of government and law. We must not be blind to the fact that although these workers may be economic nonentities, they are still "people" with all the psychological and material needs of people. As such they will challenge the situation in which they find themselves and do so with what seem to be the most practical and effective weapons at their disposal. Remembering that the basic orientation, both material and psychological, is pecuniary because of the nature of our society, it becomes relatively easy to understand why trade unions should be welcomed by workers in spite of unbelievable external pressures; and why these same trade unions should be so fanatically feared by those who worship the "divinity" of property.

Because of the over-all environment created by our mass production, businessman's civilization, workers are not yet likely to follow a consistently rational line of theory and action, except under the most acute situations. Despite the growing centralization of American industry, the well-cultivated, shadowy habits of the past have kept alive a sense of individualism in the American worker. As obviously anachronistic as it was, the Horatio Alger yarn died as hard as a tough old Cape Cod, deep-sea fisherman. It is still politically expedient for the American politician to castigate all who suggest the existence of antagonistic classes in America. On sheer statistical evidence alone nearly half of all employed Americans are industrial wage earners. We have a huge industrial proletariat in America whose average family income is less than $36.00 per week, but almost everybody outside the proletariat, and a good many inside, simply look at it and say it is not there.

Right now this unrecognized proletariat is rocking the economic boat because an acute situation has arisen, which perils the four great psychological drives of wage earners.

Laborers have wants and desires strangely similar to those of other people. If they were to be asked what they wanted from life and labor, their answers would be these:

1. They want recognition and status.
2. They want adequate income for a comfortable standard of living.
3. They want long-range security.
4. They want the right to act collectively with their fellows.

In exact proportion to the extent that these wants are jeopardized or attacked, will there be industrial unrest and conflict. To expect these drives to be static is to be foolhardy. The worker's concept of his own needs is dynamic and is likely to remain so.

Surely it requires no great depth of perception to recognize the manner in which these wants are being presently assaulted.

During the war the industrial worker enjoyed a newly found sense of status and dignity. In spite of the utter monotony of his job he was engaged in what he believed to be the heroic task of winning a war against Fascism and he believed that his industrial contribution was an essential one. He knew also that fewer man-hours were lost by strikes and work stoppages than the service hours lost on a comparable basis by the armed forces through A.W.O.L. He deeply resented the hysterical exaggeration by the nation's press of what few strikes there were, but he swallowed his pride and stuck doggedly to his task.

With the coming of peace he watched his status miserably dissolve in the acids of labor baiting that were sprayed in his direction. Bewildered by the sudden ferocity of the attack levelled against him and his fellows, he slowly awoke to the realization that he was being made ready as the scapegoat of inflation. With the wrath of injured economic pride, he combined with great numbers of his fellows to preserve an adequate income for an advancing, rather than a retreating, standard of living. To his dismay he discovered that this was exactly what the biggest of his bosses wanted him to do. They were cushioned with carry-back and carry-forward tax provisions; their treasuries were swollen with inordinate war profits; they were not at all happy about the independence of workers with war bonds and unions with strike funds. What better time was there to break the financial strength of workers, and at the same time blame these very workers for inflation itself?

This worker who withstood the harsh attacks of so many of his fellow Americans and approached financial ruin in order to win an 18½-cent an hour wage increase, watched his bosses batter and crush the OPA, watched prices begin their upward spiral, watched his real income dwindle day by day, watched a ruthless, reactionary coalition in Congress run roughshod over an extended Social Security Bill, attack unemployment compensation and pass a series of hysterically punitive labor laws, and then he knew with a sickening inward terror that his desire for long-range security, perhaps the deepest desire of his life, was being offered up on the altar of cynical philosophy of boom and bust.

Now this same worker, along with nearly all of his kind, has reached a conclusion that under the circumstances would appear to be logical. He feels that he is engaged in a war, a war that includes his right to act collectively, but which goes beyond that and challenges his very right to call himself free.

Our worker is in a very angry mood today and all the labor "agitators" from Chicago to Moscow could not have done one tenth as much to agitate him as have the great captains of American industry.

How can the middle-class, white-collar American honestly say that America's industrial workers have no case? How can they, on the basis of prejudice, any longer blindly ignore the psychological history of our present crisis in industrial relations?

If one could accomplish nothing more than the tiniest shaking of middle-class American anti-labor prejudices, a significant advance would be made. These are times that most surely call for objective, dispassionate liberal leadership; but thus far, bourgeois Americans have only succeeded in allowing themselves to be led dangerously far along the road to blindly prejudiced reaction.

Survival Towns

MANFRED A. CARTER

The day seems destined to come when Americans will fill the gas tank, and an extra can, to drive as far into the hills as the car will go and then to walk. Each man will carry what he thinks essential to the survival of his family. Each family will be praying that the cloud of radiation and disease germs, from the nearest city, has not reached them. Of course those who still cling to the cosmopolitan hive will be spared the necessity for this wild flight, also the consciousness of it. They will be disintegrated into flying dust. Each fleeing man will be desperately alone and desperately unprepared.

One does not need to prove the danger of an Atomic Armageddon, and some few people realize it, as well as admit it, but can anything be done to alleviate the disaster—if all our plans for peace do fail? The most obvious solution is a world dictatorship, by agreement or by conquest, but some will believe that freedom for a few survivors in the hills holds more promise for the future of society. Another solution would be deliberate decentralization, but social inertia will probably prevent it. There remains only the possibility of fragmentary decentralization—the immediate organization of survival towns, as models for others to be formed, towns completely self-reliant and independent.

Even in days of peace the gray brush of depression is poised over us. In spite of all our potentials for prosperity we have just emerged from the era in which more than twelve million were unemployed, when the dispossessed went as refugees out on marginal land and tried to learn unfamiliar skills of agriculture.

In the cities, one of the devices of the depression was to help the unemployed to work for themselves in various small salvage industries. Unfortunately life is not logical, and it is quite possible to starve in the midst of plenty. Even now, a year after peace is won, an American cannot buy simple and inexpensive parts for his old automobile. He may pay a dollar a pound for butter and seventy cents a pound for stew beef. Gamblers play havoc with the food supply and labor attempts a tyranny in overalls. Profiteers are not limited to wartimes.

The economic strata of the world are in upheaval and the people need some insurance for the simple necessities of living. Not all of the starving in Europe is due to a general lack of food. Some still eat well. In America, and in the world, the coöperatives offer a plan for insurance against hunger. This plan has been demonstrated for years in the Scandinavian countries and has gradually extended its scope. What is needed now is a coöperative community.

China survived almost complete disintegration of her culture in large areas. She moved her universities and set up her factories in small coöperative units, often hidden in caves or in homes. She survived, not by bigness but by smallness of organization. And China is supposed to be conservative.

We would not try to hold back progress, to substitute the hand loom for the factory, as Gandhi suggests, or even cry out resentment at the birth of the atomic age. One does not need to be retrogressive in order to plan a safeguard for emergency, only to admit the ugly realities which threaten us. Even in times of prosperity there is always the problem of public relief, which might be served by the total coöperative.

Is there any reason why our prisons and state hospitals might not extend their present production for local use until they were entirely self-supporting, instead of a tax burden? Is there something so holy about the capitalistic system that no other experiments may be made? In these smaller economic laboratories ideas might be tested before necessity forces the whole nation into days of chaos. Decentralization may come by bombs and rockets when inertia prevents its coming by logic. Better for all of us if men have thought about it. The time of safety is running out. But, even within our present system, there is a place for the total coöperative as a safety valve against economic chaos, which we undergo periodically.

A short circuit town might still survive when the central system had broken down, if the plans had been made in advance and tested by experiment. Among those plans should be a minimum organization for survival in time of war or time of scarcity. There are a few basic essentials which any such community might provide. One large factory, with rudimentary machinery, could make uniform clothing, simple furniture, building materials, bicycles, and primitive farm equipment. The tool-making machinery, with spare parts, would need to be introduced out of our present order. Obsolete equipment of mass production could well serve.

Such a survival town should be located in the center of a farming area and be composed of a few hundred people, for ease of control. To be really independent the community would need to be located near some source of power—water, oil, coal or forest area—unless sun engines can be made practical. A local scrip, or credit, might be substituted for money and based upon a unit of labor. This factory could be operated all year by those unskilled in agriculture, supplemented by winter work of the farmers. In such a community, the tyrannny of style, obsolescence, and social competition would be lessened. New fall hats would not be a necessity if all hats were of a few basic and permanent styles. Living up to the mode is a luxury that catastrophe days might ignore. American women would resent this interruption of their mania of materialism, but they would also resent atomic annihilation! In a simpler life, some of them might attain a beauty that the drug store cannot supply. Others would wilt, regrettably. Women would be the greatest obstacle to such a community, but some of them might be the leaders of it. Women usually do lead in social reform, witness the churches and the culture associations.

Of course life would be more drab and less interesting, but it might be alleviated by local literature, drama, education, and recreation. A community church, a community school, a community theater and similar efforts could not compete with Broadway and Hollywood, but they might make life livable. America was founded upon the strength of such community activities. Modern culture is more fascinating, but we could endure the simpler life.

Horses and bicycles are much less exciting than automobiles, but many lived without the great-god-gasoline during the war, and most Europeans have always pedalled their way to a sort of happiness which they claim is superior in poise, health, and local friendship.

It is not necessary to found such a community upon extremes of logical theory, as was the Brooks Farm experiment. We do not need to make such a community into a planned Utopia, but into a place for survival during catastrophe and as a safety outlet during periods when mass production breaks down. Only the basic material necessities need be regulated differently, all else may continue in its present fascinating variety and confusion. The individual may still be free in everything except the privilege of robbing his neighbor of food and shelter.

Any western town has some of this solidarity even now. I lived in Idaho during the war and made several trips to the East and West Coasts. It was like moving from a land of peace into a land of war. I also found that the people of Idaho did not understand the depression. They had never really felt it, because they were so nearly self-sufficient in the necessities of life. And such towns are always less addicted to the mode than a more urban area. A rural man is not in disgrace because he wears overalls, even women wear them at times. Who is to say that New York is really the only true America? What this suggestion of a security offers is an intensification of our present rural security in times of necessity. Even in Europe the starving has not been in rural areas.

Many western towns already accept the coöperatives. I would like to see some town that is already successfully using a coöperative dairy, a coöperative canning factory, a coöperative store, and has a real local community spirit to add a general coöperative factory for a few essential tools of living. Such a factory would only supplement the more efficient methods of mass production elsewhere. It might even be limited to labor by a jail population, or by the patients in a state hospital, or it might be used as a welfare project. Another way to this end would be an extension of the handcraft industries, already successful in many communities. Better still would be a project undertaken by a group of idealists.

The most difficult step to the promotion of the survival town would be the training of management. I wonder if there are students of sociology, ministers, teachers, doctors, and others who are gravely concerned by the failures of our present system and who would find relief in doing something to alleviate catastrophe. I wonder if there are men of wealth who have become disillusioned with wealth and might endow such towns or schools in the coöperative way.

Some form of Socialism is probably inevitable. Our unharnessed capitalism has raced us into chaos. Some who do not enjoy the prospect of a total Socialism might be in favor of a socialistic safety device. Perhaps some form of government Socialism in the midst of a capitalistic economy may succeed. Perhaps the final war may be averted. But, in any case, some phases of the survival town idea have already proved practical. To read the newspapers one would think that all the governmental and private experiments in this field had failed, but newspapers are supported by capitalistic advertising. Naturally the plantation owners fight the coöperative farms organized for share croppers. An unbiased compilation of the literature on such projects would be a service to humanity.

When the atomic rockets crash, is there nothing an American can do but fill up the car and race toward the hills, unprepared and lonely? Few will be strong enough to survive by individual effort.

The monastery is not a totally negative institution, even though some do deplore its unnatural sex life. Could there be a non-sectarian community based upon idealism, to discover a pattern for communities in disaster days?

The small, socially planned community is as old as history. What has been done? What is being done? What may be done? Can there be survival towns?

An Experiment in Purposeful Communication

CHARLES WILLIAM PHILLIPS

Some years before the war, back in January, 1937, in fact, four young people in their late teens and early twenties, among them the present writer, banded together to form an organization called "The Cavalier Club." The purpose of this club in the beginning was much the same as that of any other literary club. There was a slight difference in methods, however: instead of holding meetings, members were to circulate their essays, stories, verse, or whatever, through the mail, the Manager, as he was then called, controlling circulation, imposing fines for delay, and so forth.

The important thing about this group, however, was not to be found in its methods for "purposeful communication by letters," as its primary aim was stated in the Constitution, but in the genuine freedom of thought and expression fostered and encouraged among its members. Every effort was made to get each member to think his own thoughts and then to put them on paper, thereafter to be subjected to the usually charitable criticism of his fellow members. We really believed people ought to think, express their thoughts, and try to profit by the give-and-take of mutual criticism.

As the members grew up, so also the club grew up. Early records of the business and literary activities of the Cavalier Club reveal a certain amount of unavoidable adolescence. Our later records are, we rejoice to admit, revelatory of some degree of maturity. But the club grew not only in wisdom and stature, but also in numbers. We had, I believe, some twenty-two members at our peak. Not a world-shaking mob, to be sure; but, then, we believed in the value of minorities, a faith difficult to maintain in this post-war Age of the Absolute Weapon with its omnipresent totalitarian tendencies. Perhaps if hundreds, even thousands, of such clubs as the one of which I have been speaking were to spring up all over the United States of America we might regain some of our lost faith in the power and the value of minorities. In any case, the best way a man can express his faith in the worth and strength of minorities is to get busy and form a small group himself.

A more interesting "congregation" it would be difficult to find anywhere. Three of the founders were Anglo-Catholics, the fourth was an Agnostic. One of our educational directors was an Agnostic, another was

a devout Sephardic Jew. Other officers and members were Protestants, Roman Catholics, Freethinkers. Our membership included college graduates, college students, high school graduates, high school students, at least one Master of Arts and one Master of Science, and even an Anglican priest! Members were, in short, male and female, theists and non-theists, Marxists and Thomists, radicals and reactionaries, New Dealers and Rugged Individualists, American Laborites and Republicans, all sorts and conditions of men. Their interests ran from ontology to otology, from theology to engineering, from literature to journalism, from science to sonnets, from Thomas Aquinas to Terpsichore. As we grew in numbers, we grew in depth and breadth of interest and understanding. And as our interests broadened and deepened, as our understanding of one another became more profound, we came to feel increasingly the need for a statement of our philosophy as a Club.

In 1940 the opportunity for a statement of our Cavalier Club philosophy presented itself when it became apparent that the Club was in sad need of reorganization. Originally, all the business and literary activities of the Club had been carried on through the mail. However, as the membership grew, and as the members grew up, it had become necessary to form discussion groups, hold meetings, establish a Bureau of Information to collect interesting pamphlets, magazine articles, and so forth, for distribution among the members, appoint Preceptors who would write and lecture on their fields of specialization, and in many other ways expand the activities of the Club. We discovered that the Cavalier Club had become a Club containing within itself several smaller clubs: we had the Aquinas Discussion Group, the Great Books Discussion Group—modelled after "Invitation to Learning"—and other discussion groups in philosophy, literature, science, economics, and so forth. Many of the members of one group were also members of other groups. I was a member of all groups, I think, except the science and the literature groups. Some Club members were members of only one group. In order to unify this chaos, a new Constitution had to be drafted and the task of preparing it fell to me.

In the Preface to the Constitution, I tried to express the aims of the Club: "...to develop interest in purposeful communciation by letters; to stimulate interest in matters literary, philosophical, scientific, religious, historical, sociological and cultural; to disseminate factual information, convictions, beliefs, and opinions, of an educational nature, allowing for a wide freedom of expression, yet adhering to the principles of the Preamble to this Constitution...to encourage educational, intellectual, and cultural development. . . . Further, the Cavalier Club shall inform its members of such movements, books, concerts, and other intellectual, spiritual, and cultural opportunities as shall aid its members in attaining a better understanding and appreciation of the world in which we live. . ." I think we really lived up to all this, in our own small way.

But it was to the preparation of the Preamble that I gave the most thought. We had grown up, as individuals and as a Club. We needed a common ground, a mutually-agreed-upon philosophy, in order that all our activities might have some meaning, in order that we might not degenerate into a stuffy mutual-admiration society, in order that our communication might be truly purposeful. This Preamble must express a common ground of belief for all Humanists, theistic and non-theistic, who were or who might become members of the Club. To our knowledge, only one member found any difficulty in subscribing to the Preamble; she was one of the founders of the Club, the Agnostic. Other theistic and non-theistic members, Freethinkers, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, had no such difficulty. The Preamble, I felt, should not only state our common ground, but ought to issue forth from our common experience. After thoughtful consideration, I submitted the following:

Preamble to the Constitution of the Cavalier Club:

We, the Members of the Cavalier Club, believe in the fundamental trustworthiness of the human reason; the worth of human purpose; the nobility of the highest human endeavors—literary, social, scientific, religious, philosophical, artistic, scholarly, and cultural; the excellence of all activities of man directed by rightly-ordered wills; the necessity of education for the proper direction of human action, such education being understood to include ethics and the inculcation of spiritual ideals.

We believe in man: we believe that he is more than animal, that his rational nature is that which distinguishes him from the beasts; and we believe, therefore, that we should do our share in emphasizing the activities of man which spring from his nature as a rational being.

We believe in free speech, not because one man's opinion is as good as another's, but because one man's opinion is not as good as another's; for we hope by the contrast and comparison of opinions to arrive at some glimpse of the truth.

We desire to arrive at some understanding of the truth, because we believe that it is within man's ability to seek and find truth; and that it is in man's ability to seek and find truth that his ultimate significance lies.

This Preamble was adopted unanimously. To this day, the present author believes that it expresses clearly and succinctly the common ground upon which may stand Humanists of every variety, Christian and non-Christian, theistic and non-theistic.

Some of us, in those days before the war, gave most of our free time to the Club. I once estimated that I gave some thirty hours each week to various Cavalier Club activities.

The war changed all that. On paper, the Cavalier Club still exists. But the members are scattered, busy, confused, and otherwise too occupied to give time to the Club. During the war, I received many letters from members telling me how anxious they were to go into action again as soon as hostilities ceased. Events too vast, too far beyond the individual's control, situations such as the housing shortage, marriage, school, and so forth, have made this impossible up to the present moment. It is still my hope that the Cavalier Club may someday be reborn and stand again for the high principles first enunciated in our Preamble, but actually born out of our experiences together, our common thought and aspirations.

It might well be that others will be interested in forming just such organizations as the Cavalier Club. We believe that dozens of such little organizations, emphasizing the dignity of human personality in a world which little recognizes that dignity, working for mutual understanding, aiding their members toward healthy, socially-useful self-expression and toward clear, cogent thinking, would have immense value in our present society with its far-too-great emphasis on glamour, bigness, organization, and other such externals. I will be glad to furnish copies of the Preamble and Preface to the Constitution of the Cavalier Club to any interested persons. But I cannot close without a word of warning: never allow your organization to become too big; bigness would defeat its very purpose —emphasis on the dignity of the human individual.

The Most Unforgettable Character I Have Known

LEO HIRSCH

To tell you about this remarkable person, I must necessarily reveal to you my own mental attitude prior to the time of meeting. I was the product of a Hebrew-Christian training but had come under the influence of Kant, Spinoza, Voltaire, and Thomas Paine. At the time, I was dissatisfied with the prevailing churches and was seeking a non-theological religion that would be my permanent anchorage. My Sunday morning habit was to visit the different churches in our community in the hope of finding such a free haven for my restless spirit. On one of these quests, I happened to seek shelter from a thunder shower under the protecting portals of Carnegie Hall. While standing there, I saw a steady stream of men and women enter the hall. My curiosity was aroused and I followed the crowd.

The program handed to me by one of the ushers announced a course of lectures by Prof. Felix Adler, under the auspices of the Ethical Culture Society. The hall was fairly well filled with white men and women and a sprinkling of colored persons. This immediately conveyed to me that I was in a democratic atmosphere. The meeting opened at 11:15 a.m. with a musical number of great simplicity and beauty. After this, Professor Adler read passages from Ralph Waldo Emerson's essay on *Self-Reliance,* which he used as his text. Then followed more music and the lecture. There was no prayer, no ritual. The purpose of the talk was not concerned with such negatives as the authenticity of the Scriptures, or of miracles, or the meaning of the Trinity, but rather with certain positive, consecrating influences that we ought to bring into our own lives, the lives of our children, and of our fellow men. The entire meeting was characterized by a noble simplicity and a reverence for the ethical ideal.

My first impression of the man was that he was undersized, with a remarkable development of his frontal head region. He had a serene, tranquil mien, and his delivery was deliberate and conversational. His mastery of the English language was a rare treat and he avoided speaking above his audience. Sitting in the tenth row, it appeared to me as though he were talking directly at me and directing his remarks to me. That address was a landmark in my religious experience. His philosophy as expounded that morning made a profound impression upon me. Here was a religious teacher whose message by-passed tradition, dogmas, and creeds, and placed the emphasis on the supremacy of ethics (the art and science of right human relations) which he deemed not a by-product or an ingredient of religion but to be religion in its truest sense. For righteous living was the fibre out of which man weaved the many different patterns of religion. The keystone of his message was "the indefeasible worth" of every human being and the achievement of fine human relations the ultimate objective. "Unanimity in Deed and Diversity in Creed" was his criterion.

My interest in this leader and the religious movement he started was immediate and intense. On leaving, I purchased Professor Adler's book, *An Ethical Philosophy of Life,* and the careful reading and study of this book resulted in my joining the Society. Here at long last I found a religion that broke the ecclesiastical, social, and economic chains that fettered the human spirit and that granted every individual member the right to moral autonomy and full freedom of growth. Here was a religious philosophy that was fresh, vivid, personal, free from formalities that obscure the real meaning of religion. Here was the humblest of all religious movements, for it did not arrogate to itself the claim that it had delivered the last and final truth of the universe once and for all but it proclaimed that religion was an organism in a constant state of growth and development. It proclaimed that what we need today is more light on our tangled economic and international relations.

During the first year of my novitiate, I quickly realized that in this ethical religion the things that were constantly emphasized were our relations to others and that what these human relations imply are the greatest and primary things, to which all else must be subordinated. I also found this ethical religion to be a religion of action. For it had its roots in spiritual reality and demanded as its objective the exaltation of life and the transfiguration of human relations.

Felix Adler not only preached ethics but translated his ethical convictions into actual living. He sponsored and helped to organize the National Child Labor Committee, and for many years worked to pass Child Labor Laws in many states. His spirited work on the Tenement House Commission was instrumental in passing the Tenement House Law in 1901 that compelled landlords to put windows in every room and add the necessary fire escapes for the protection of family life.

His practical philosophy led him to apply his spirit to the movements to better the society about him. In many of his activities, he was himself the leader who bore the brunt of battle. He was a fearlessly fighting friend of human beings longing for a higher life, wherever he found them.

After I had thoroughly familiarized myself with the movement and its objectives, I placed before Dr. Adler the need of ethicizing our economic life. I strongly believed that the businessmen belonging to the Society ought to clarify and define the ideal of the service which this particular vocation is to render. I pointed out that the great difficulties to be overcome in the industrial field would prove to be a supreme test of his ethical philosophy. Here there were mountains of selfishness and acquisitiveness to be moved and he gave us the driving force that brought the Businessmen's Group into existence. Many fine things came out of that group. One large silk manufacturer introduced industrial representation in his plants. Another businessman created a new type of dwelling and settlement for the working classes. Still another started a Co-operative Marketing System for Farmers. To me, the finest thing worked out by this group was the five principles they formulated as a result of study and discussion:

1. That there is a spiritual worth in every human being which industry must recognize.
2. That human exploitation is immoral and socially destructive.
3. That the highest service which any calling can render is the development of personality in all those who are affected by it.
4. That service to the community and not profit seeking should be the main purpose of business and industry.

5. That there is a creative impulse in the mass of men sufficient to carry on industry without sole reliance upon pecuniary motive; business and industry can call forth the same constructive interests that play such an important part in the practice of the sciences and the arts.

The world which Felix Adler saw during his lifetime was indeed an ever-changing world. It began for him as a world in which railways were still new and stagecoaches not yet unknown; it ended for him as a world of the airplane and the radio. In no other epoch of the world's history has any one man's lifetime encompassed such changes in the outward aspects of life. Much that was familiar to him in his age would have seemed to him as a child incredible magic; yet I never heard him talk very much about this wonderful transformation. What impressed him was the change—far more wonderful and interesting to him!—in *the moral and social experiences and ideas of men.* He lived in a country which accepted and maintained slavery; he saw the slave set free. He lived in a country still divided against itself; he lived to see the nation made one and indivisible. He saw the rise of industrialism and the formation of powerful corporations and powerful labor unions, involving new problems of industrial justice hardly less serious than slavery itself. He saw great changes in education and in religious thinking. He saw new movements for international amity progressing, until overturned by the most destructive of wars. After victory, he saw new problems emerging. These and the like, rather than necromancies of science and invention, were the changes in the world which impressed him, because they concerned those principles of life which it was his single object to study and apply. If he were alive today he would point out our complete social unpreparedness for what to do with our achievement and control of atomic energy. He would point out the great disparity between our technological efficiency and our social and ethical capacity. He would say that we have learned to control and exploit the forces of nature without any definite ideas of what uses to put them to and before we were ethically developed to put them to social purposes.

To put it differently, he was interested in discovering means to release in men and women the dynamic spiritual energies that are latent in all of us and that would transform our civilization. It was this that drew him to the schools and colleges of the land as a guide and counselor to students in the midst of a revolution in scientific, economic, and religious thought. Out of that background and rich experience, he came to the following conclusions with which his name, as religious teacher and educator, will be lastingly associated:

1. The supremacy of the ethical end of life above all others, whatsoever.
2. In the fellowship of a perfect society every human being must count and be included.
3. All human beings, although unlike, are *morally equal* as fellows in creating the ideal society.

Felix Adler tried to teach the American people that essential religion—ethical religion—is one of the world's supremest needs and that was his greatest contribution to the progress not only of the United States but of the world at large. He was the living example of the modern religious leader, as by his teachings and by his life he tried to educate persons as to how the religious life of the race can develop intelligently, inspiringly, reverently, and yet be completely divorced from all dogma, all unreason, all superstition, and all emotionalism and sentimentality.

I have seen him, listened to him, and talked with him over and over again during a period of thirty-five years. During the formation of the Businessmen's Group, we had the rare privilege of meeting with him and discussing with him the fundamental problems of industry every fortnight for nearly two years. During my entire association with him, I was a devoted disciple and still feel the companionship of his invisible friendship. He called all men to that bravery "which gives power and changes things." Men everywhere were influenced by his mountain-moving faith and he left an indelible impression on our civilization. It was an inspiration to have lived in his intellectual and spiritual company.

Ethics and Two Nihilisms

VICTOR S. YARROS

In the seventies of the nineteenth century there was a school, or movement, in Russia which called itself, and was called by eminent novelists and critics, Nihilism. Turgenev's Bazarov, the hero of the famous masterpiece, *Fathers and Sons,* was the typical Nihilist of the period, and his creator, Turgenev, admitted in his diary that he had shared some of Bazarov's cardinal ideas. The Nihilists rejected religion and all conventional morality. They said they did not believe in any ethical principles. They were guided by science, and science only. Where there was no science to guide them, they pleased themselves, they consulted their personal tastes. But they were civilized persons, and their tastes were not criminal, vulgar, or coarse.

This school of thought proved short-lived. Most of its adherents joined the Socialist-Revolutionary movement, became Populists, carried on propaganda in the villages and factories, worked, suffered, died for "land and freedom." The ex-Nihilists became passionate champions of the rights of the masses and of Western republicanism and constitutionalism. In the present century, in Russia, no one has called himself a Nihilist.

In the West, however, including the United States, there is an unorganized trend toward a new Nihilism, a trend for which certain philosophers are indirectly responsible. These contemporary Nihilists reject ethical principles, affirm that there is no science of ethics, and take the position that conduct is merely a matter of feeling and taste. We like certain ways and fashions, or we dislike them. There is no absolute standard of right. You cannot prove, they assert, that the Ten Commandments, or any other set of rigid injunctions, are necessary and desirable for all men under all conditions. To disobey them may be inexpedient, but it is not immoral or wrong.

The words and actions of many educated young men and women leave no doubt as to their essential Nihilism, or, as some of them say, Ethical Agnosticism. They have little use for abstractions and general ideas, they tell us. They have had just enough second-hand or third-hand acquaintance with relativism, pragmatism, skepticism, and the critical attitude to suppose that the

spirit and method of science warrant a demand for laboratory technique and procedure in realms where these are patently impossible. This misapprehension, of course, lands them in glaring absurdities.

Now, ethics is not an exact science, but it is nonetheless a science. You cannot prove, by deliberately undertaken experiments, that honesty is the best policy in business, or that there is pleasure in giving pleasure, or that mutual aid is as natural as aggressive competition. But it is childish to deny that in the millenia which have elapsed since the Dawn of Conscience in Egypt some seven thousand years ago (according to Breasted) mankind has had ample experience in many parts of the world to justify certain large inductions, or general principles. Besides, there is such a thing as common sense, and science, in the words of Huxley, is merely organized common sense.

Common sense needs no laboratory techniques to conclude that without respect for life, freedom within certain limits, property, reputation, and voluntary agreements no society could possibly exist or thrive. If there is to be order, security, and comfort, the great majority of the citizens in a given community must refrain from killing one another, stealing from one another, forging signatures, breaking contracts, libeling one another. A minority may indeed violate all or some of these requisites, but they will not thereby destroy the community. They will be treated as criminals and, when duly convicted, segregated or banished or put to death.

Thus we see that ordinary, commonplace morality is based on social and individual utility. Moses brought down to the Israelites the Tables of the Law, which, on the whole, summed up the wisdom of the community he led. The climate of opinion and sentiment of his time and people determined the form and mode of his gospel, but whether or not he really believed that Jehovah dictated the commandments, or imagined that he had heard the voice from heaven, we cannot know. Be this as it may, the people needed divine sanction for the restraints and prohibitions he imposed. A frank appeal to utility alone would scarcely have answered his great purpose as Lawgiver. Even today most of us do not live up to our fundamental beliefs. Our passions and appetites are more powerful than our ideas. We cannot always, or easily, subordinate present satisfactions to probable future pleasures or benefits. We do wrong because the flesh is weak and we cannot resist certain temptations. We run grave risks despite warnings not only of moralists but of physicians as well. Venereal disease illustrates this unpleasant truth. Such facts as these, however, do not destroy the case of the philosophical utilitarians. We do not need supernaturalism to support our present general and ordinary ethical standards.

The case is different, it must be conceded, where conduct becomes definitely altruistic, where self-denial involves hardships and sacrifices. Common sense will not agree that utilitarian considerations fully account for this kind of behavior. Men who fight and die for causes that cannot possibly benefit them personally—for social or political reform, for example, or national unity, or world federation—do not expect rewards of any sort. They are animated by ideals, by love of truth, beauty, or goodness.

The philosophical utilitarians contend that such men as these act in the instances supposed not from a sense of duty, not in a spirit of sacrifice, but from a profound desire to fulfill or realize their exceptional natures. Their ideals and principles, in other words, are part of themselves, and they would not be happy, or at peace with themselves, if they did not work and, if necessary, fight and take risks in behalf of their convictions and sentiments.

There is no doubt that this interpretation is sound and valid up to a certain point. Does it cover *all* the known facts concerning altruistic behavior? Possibly not. We must not overlook the consideration, emphasized by Nietzsche and others, that there is no small ingredient of inordinate pride and vanity in apparent altruism. At any rate, the last word has certainly not been said by psychology and other sciences on the problem of motivation in human conduct, or on human nature in general. To eke out explanations in this field by appeals to supernaturalism is wholly illegitimate and contrary to the spirit of science or philosophy.

But let us return to the question whether, as hinted above, distinguished and influential thinkers have given aid and comfort to the ethical Nihilists of our day. Let me quote from the timely and instructive volume, *Philosophy in American Education,* by Prof. Brand Blanshard. In a chapter on the climate of opinion, he says:

> What is still harder for some to bear, it [Positivism] has gone on to deny the possibility of a normative science of ethics. It is inclined to hold that ethical judgments, like those of metaphysics, are not significant statements at all; they are neither true nor false; they are merely expressions of attitude or feeling on the part of those who make them. Thus, no objectively valid judgment about the good, no objectively valid standard of right or wrong is any longer credible.

Of course, to deny the possibility of a normative science of ethics, as Professor Blanshard points out, is to imply that "between approval and condemnation of Nazism there is, objectively, nothing to choose."

Millions of lay persons would be amazed and shocked by such an implication as this. And they would indignantly repudiate any school of self-styled philosophers who sympathize with it. What, they would ask, is meant by the phrase "objective judgments of standards" in a discussion of morals or the science of ethics? Ideas of morality are human, and if several hundred million educated and half-educated men and women render certain ethical judgments, and accept certain ethical standards, is it illegitimate to consider these tolerably objective? That millions of primitive or savage peoples have different and lower standards and notions is true, but scarcely relevant. We have heard of head-hunters, of African or Australian natives who know nothing of our civilization. But what of that fact? We necessarily have in mind what we call civilization, oriental or occidental, when we talk or write about ethical ideas or practices. Relativity in morals has long been a familiar concept, but so is the concept of standards and principles adhered to, or at least recognized by, millions of civilized peoples, and these are objective enough in a scientific sense. When we say that Beethoven, as a composer, is superior to Offenbach, or Sousa, are we subjective or objective? The question is a futile one. We all know that in certain strata of society Beethoven is not popular, but that does not deter us from taking it for granted that cultivated persons the world over prefer Beethoven to Sousa or Offenbach.

Even Bertrand Russell feels constrained to "admit" that science does not deal with questions of value. But this admission is wholly unwarranted and indeed unscientific. Are not values "facts"? If egoism is a fact, altruism is likewise a fact. Men do act altruistically in many instances, and that is just as important and im-

pressive *a fact* as any other. The Ten Commandments, of course, are disobeyed by many persons in every civilized community, but they are obeyed by many *more* persons in the same communities. Here, then, are facts on both sides of the argument, and neither category can be ignored nor belittled. Alike what we say and what we do daily give evidence of the fact that human beings are not all bad or all good, and that social conduct is the product of very much mixed motives. Common sense fully recognizes this elementary truth, and ethics, as a science, cannot quarrel with common sense and ordinary experience. Is there any reason why it should? The answer is clear.

The superficiality and looseness of the talk about the alleged amorality, or moral neutrality, of science is as irritating as it is difficult to explain. There is nothing new in the fact that scientific inventions and discoveries can be used by base and malicious men for destructive purposes. There has been much excited and hysterical lamentation in connection with the atomic bomb. In the wrong hands, this bomb *may* annihilate all the centers of our civilization! But there is no reason why civilization should run this risk; it has the power and the opportunity to make sure that the right elements of society control the production and use of this terrible weapon. Science *has* something to say about this problem, too. Not physics or astronomy or chemistry, but certainly sociology, ethics, politics, and psychology must demand to be heard on the question of what to do with the atomic bomb, and how to prevent its falling into the wrong hands. The simplest and most convenient and useful tools have been used by criminals—knives, razors, clubs, hemp, hose, and what not.

Science is the work of human beings called scientists. Are these members of society amoral, or neutral morally? *Certainly not.* They are charged with certain tasks, but if other tasks required by society are neglected under our present division of labor, the men of science can properly be called upon to devote some time and energy to these neglected tasks. The protection of our civilization and the safeguarding of our basic rights need not be left entirely to lawyers and politicians, or soldiers. The atomic age has its own problems, and the solution of them should and must be attended to by those who are the logical and natural laborers in that vineyard.

Among those who assert that science has nothing to say about moral or social values, and does not seek to determine the ends or purposes for which inventions and discoveries are used, are the adherents of orthodox Christianity. These conservatives argue that there can be no real conflict between science and religion, since they operate in different realms. In such assertions as this, clearly, the term science is meant to include the social sciences and near sciences, hence the proposition is *not* true. The social sciences certainly deal with human values—ethical and artistic. And in this work they cannot depart from the method and spirit of the exact sciences. Science rejects or ignores revelation. It relies solely on observation, experimentation, verification, and strict induction from the available data. Our values need no support from revelation, which, indeed, yields an extremely dubious and lame basis for any solid and substantial value. The appeal to revelation plays into the hands of the Nihilists. If we cannot develop a sound and scientific ethical code without the aid of superstition and mysticism, then Nihilism will grow and spread, and ultimately triumph. But knowledge, reason, and common sense, as we have seen, provide together a firm and enlightened foundation for social morality. Our ideals *are* real, in the sense that they have evolved naturally and are part of our intellectual and moral equipment. They are dear and indispensable to us. Our critical intelligence approved of them. They have passed the test of science and pragmatic philosophy.

Voices of Latin America*
IX. Samuel Ramos: Mexican Humanist

JOHN H. HERSHEY

Strikingly similar to the outlook of many Humanists in the United States is the "New Humanism" of one of Mexico's leading philosophers, Samuel Ramos. Born in the city of Morelia in 1897, Ramos was educated at his birthplace and at the Military Medical School in Mexico City. He is professor of philosophy and aesthetics in the National University of Mexico, President of the Mexican Commission of Intellectual Cooperation, and editor of the scholarly periodical, *Filosofia y Letras.* Ramos has also been made head of the Mexican-North American Institute of Cultural Relations which has for its object the promotion of cultural contacts between Mexico and the United States.

Articles and books which have been written by the Mexican thinker include such varied subjects as painting, education, morality, and philosophy. An important book is his *Historia de la Filosofía en México* (1943) which gives an account of philosophy in Mexico beginning with the ideas of pre-Columbian Aztecs and concluding with the philosophies of contemporary thinkers. In this article on Ramos as a Humanist, I shall discuss his book, *Hacia un Nuevo Humanismo (Toward a New Humanism)* 1940. The author develops a conception of man for the present crisis of civilization. The following outline attempts to summarize some of his important conclusions.

A sharp dualism, Ramos says, exists in modern life, separating the material from the spiritual. This dualism is particularly exemplified, on the one hand, by civilization in many of its aspects, and, on the other, by culture. Our civilization has developed one-sidedly, overemphasizing material things and goals at the expense of moral and aesthetic values. The increasing multiplicity of things produced is thought by many to be of great importance. Capitalism exaggerates money and power. Excitements of various kinds are sought as stimulants. Barbarism and war are rampant. Machines in industry and warfare enslave man instead of serving him. Forms of art are praised for their technique, even when they lack quality.

Culture, on the contrary, means not merely the ac-

*The ninth of a series of articles on Latin-American leaders appearing from time to time in the columns of UNITY.

cumulation of knowledge, but primarily the consciousness of spiritual values, such as morality, truth, and beauty. These values are the true ends of human existence. Material civilization with all its resources should be the means for realizing these values. Unfortunately, however, civilization has evoloved in such a manner as to raise material means to goals of living, excluding often the genuine spiritual values. Thus the dualism in modern life.

What can resolve this dualism and make the material serve the spiritual? The answer of Ramos is that a new Humanist philosophy needs to be applied to civilization. What he calls "philosophical anthropology" is the attempt to understand man as a whole. All the diverse elements making up human nature, such as the instinctive, the economic, the rationalistic, must be taken into account and ordered into a hierarchy of values. To know man as a whole and his essential nature is necessary.

Let us, therefore, survey Ramos' conception of human nature, society, and the cosmos.

In the author's reflections on human nature, the meaning of liberty, personality, and values is examined. Liberty, contrary to the usual opinion, is not identical with indeterminism, if we assume the existence of different types of determinism instead of mechanical necessity only. For the means that man uses to accomplish his ends correspond to causes in the physical universe; and the goals of men correspond to effects. Although man does not have absolute freedom, he does have a margin of liberty. Man possesses "autonomy and spontaneity."

With regard to personality, Ramos acknowledges that it is undoubtedly based on our physico-psychical nature and on our social environment, but it is more than these. Personality is the "I" that is not merely conscious of external things and of self, but is also aware of aesthetic, moral, and intellectual values. Personality is not a fixed entity, but a process which each human being must develop. The essence of personality is this recognition of spiritual values and the will to realize them in individual life and social organization. The instinctive and other elements of human nature are real, but no one element constitutes the whole of man. Man is an organic whole, including all the diverse phases of his nature, with personality and its values at the apex of his being.

With reference to human society, Ramos does not outline any detailed view of what its structure should be, but says:

> It is evident that all future organizations of society ought to be planned in view of the well-being and happiness of all men, without distinction of class, correcting all the injustices which exist today; but this end will not be fully attained if the totality of human aspirations is not taken into account. Humanism appears today as an ideal to combat the inhumanity engendered by the capitalistic and materialistic bourgeoisie.

The nature of the cosmos is also considered by the Mexican philosopher. It is a mistake, he says, to attempt to explain all phenomena of the universe by physical and chemical laws only. Rather, diverse levels or regions of being exist within the cosmos, as follows: (1) Real objects, as physical, chemical, biological, and psychological facts; (2) ideal objects, as mathematical facts, relations, essences; (3) the world of values, as goodness, truth, beauty; and (4) human existence which is the most independent of the four levels and in which the three previous levels are joined. Thus a pluralism of orders exists within the cosmos. Each order has its own laws and principles, but is not completely independent of the other realms of being. Man and his values, in this view, are real in the universe.

The following quotation unfolds Ramos' conception of the relation of man to nature:

> The world of values and the world of reality are spheres which complement each other. Man is the mediator between these two worlds. He can propose values as goals for action and realize them in life. Nature is a determined causal order which moves like a machine, without any meaning or end. Man is able to introduce a worthful purpose into this movement, and to give the world the meaning which it lacks. What is described thus is not a hypothetical action of man, but the real process of his effort in history. What we call civilization and culture is precisely this transformation of nature, which orients it to the realization of certain human ends. The forces of nature are blind in their original state, but man has dominated and directed them so that they serve a useful purpose. In conjunction, civilization and culture signify a work which tends to elevate nature to a plane in which meaning and value are acquired.
>
> . . . Man unites within himself all the conditions necessary for transforming the world into a higher order directed toward worthful ends. He has, thus, awareness of value and free will. He is capable of forming purposes with respect to his future, and of taking values as ends of his action in the world.

The New Humanism of Ramos thus attempts to abolish the dualistic thought which separates material civilization from spiritual culture. Material civilization ought to be considered as one of the important means by which we can promote human ideals. Ideals without material means and effort are impotent; force and material things without ideals are dangerous. Both the material and the spiritual have their proper function. The former is the means; the latter, the end. But present civilization often makes the material the end,—neglecting justice, beauty, truth, personality. Thus the crisis in human affairs. The philosophy of Humanism, according to Samuel Ramos, attempts to correct this error by exposing the dualistic attitude and by urging the unification of material means and spiritual purposes in both personal life and social organization.

Should Restrictive Covenants Be Prohibited By Law?

HOMER A. JACK

"Don't fence me in!" That is the plaintive cry of 350,000 Negro citizens of Chicago—Negro citizens who have fought for democracy on the battlefront and the homefront. Negro citizens who have produced more than their share of Marion Andersons, George Washington Carvers, and Duke Ellingtons. And yet, merely because of their badge of color, Negroes are limited to well-defined and inadequate areas of Chicago and are prevented from residing in many sections of Chicago and other cities. Prior to the first World War, there was little housing segregation—even in the South. What concentration existed was chiefly due to poverty.

But today an iron ring keeps out the middle-class and rich Negro as well as the poor one. And the fences around the so-called Negro ghetto are maintained by every available technique: persuasion, ostracism, violence—and always supported by legal devices.

During the first World War the idea was conceived of racial zoning, of setting aside by ordinance certain sections of a city wherein Negroes and certain other peoples could not live. In 1917, however, the U. S. Supreme Court held that municipalities could not erect racial zones. But certain people still wanted to keep Negroes out, and clever lawyers hit upon the restrictive covenant.

A restrictive covenant is an agreement between the property owners in a given neighboorhood, binding them not to sell or rent the property for a definite period of years to certain specified classes of people. These may be Mexican Americans, Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, Jews, Catholics—but most often in the Chicago area restrictive covenants are drawn to exclude Negroes.

The Oakland-Kenwood Property Owners' Association has recently drawn up what it advertises as a foolproof covenant which says that "the term 'Negro' as used herein shall include every person having one-eighth part or more of Negro blood." One-eighth Negro and therefore not a fit neighbor! If one of a man's eight great grandparents was a Negro, automatically he is disqualified from owning or renting in great sections of Chicago and many other cities. Why, even the notorious Nuremberg laws in Nazi Germany reached out, I believe, only to one's grandfather!

Restrictive covenants, like the Nuremberg laws, are based on a series of myths. And I would like to expose these myths.

The first myth is that Negroes make bad neighbors. Although most of us whites have never had the opportunity of having Negro neighbors, still this is a plausible myth as we ride the Southside elevated and see the Negro slums. But is this filth and disorganization caused by Negroes or are Negroes, for the most part, unwilling heirs to obsolete neighborhoods and dupes for real estate interests making fat profits? Howard Vincent O'Brien said in his *Chicago Daily News* column some time ago: "Mostly the landlords are white; with management by realtor and trust company." And even the National Association of Real Estate Boards in a recent survey found that the average Negro homeowner takes care of his property if it is in good repair when he obtained it. The truth is that Negroes make good neighbors and restrictive covenants must be abolished so Negroes may have the opportunity to become our neighbors in all parts of the city and suburbs.

The second myth is that mixed neighborhoods increase intergroup friction. This again is plausible, until one investigates the facts. A careful, unbiased study of the tragic race riots in 1943 showed that "Negroes and whites who have lived as neighbors did not fight one another in the Detroit race riots. They had come to know and to understand each other." The truth is that mixed neighborhoods can reduce racial friction.

The third myth is that restrictive covenants are legal and enforceable. Dr. Gunnar Myrdal—the famous Swedish social scientist who made a monumental study of American race relations for the Carnegie Foundation—said that "Because of technicalities, the U. S. Supreme Court has as yet avoided the principal issue of the general status of the covenants." Prof. D. O. McGovney of the University of California recently wrote that "so far as such agreements operate without state aid they are indeed purely the acts of individuals. But when the discriminatory objectives of private persons cannot be attained without calling upon the state for aid, and that aid is given, unconstitutional action by the state has been taken" for the Fourteenth Amendment nullifies all state action of every kind which denies the equal protection of the law. The truth is that the state courts have no right to enforce restrictive covenants and some day soon the U. S. Supreme Court will so rule.

Adolph Hitler once wrote that "the great masses of people will more easily fall victims to a great lie than to a small one." And the great lie and fourth myth which is being perpetuated is that restrictive covenants preserve property values and raise neighborhood standards. Restrictive covenants hem Negroes in, cause doubling up and other scandalous housing conditions in the Negro ghetto, destroy home life, and produce juvenile delinquency, crime, and disease. And these conditions cannot be hemmed in, but inevitably spill over into adjoining white areas. The truth is that restrictive covenants restrict the market of property and speed its depreciation by diverting the normal movement of peoples. Thus restrictive covenants should be abolished so that property values and human values can be maintained.

In summary, then, I believe that restrictive covenants should be abolished because they are uneconomic, undemocratic, and unethical.

Restrictive covenants are *uneconomic* because they tend to restrict the natural processes of city development and cause an ever-widening area of slums which returns less to the city in taxes and costs more to service with fire, police, and health protection. For these reasons, such groups as the Metropolitan Housing Council and the Public Housing Association have condemned restrictive covenants.

Restrictive covenants are *undemocratic* because they prevent all types of housing from being available, in normal times, to all people, whatever their race, religion, or national origin, and despite their character or their ability to pay. For these reasons, such groups as the City Club of Chicago and numerous labor organizations have condemned restrictive covenants.

Restrictive covenants are immoral and *unethical* because their very existence denies the brotherhood of all men. For these reasons, such groups as the Chicago Y.W.C.A. and other Protestant organizations, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and various Jewish groups have condemned restrictive covenants.

Restrictive covenants must go—by court action, by legislative action, by the refusal of property owners to sign these restrictive contracts, and by the acceptance by tenants of neighbors without regard to accident of birth. Only by these methods can we build in Chicago, and elsewhere, sound democratic neighborhoods with high standards of occupancy, yet not standards which merely exclude a man because of race, religion, or national origin. As America girds for its great housing program in old neighborhoods and new ones, let us adopt a program of fair housing practices which, first of all, means the end of restrictive covenants.

The Study Table

Christianity Against Caste

COLOR AND CONSCIENCE. *By Buell G. Gallagher. New York: Harper & Bros. 244 pp. $2.50.*

Buell Gallagher, former President of Talladega College, now professor at the Pacific School of Religion, is one of our younger scholars who does not live in an ivory tower. The subtitle of this book is "The Irrepressible Conflict."

Color challenges the Christian conscience as never before—and there is no escape. This is a remarkable presentation of the case for Christianity against caste. Chapter X is especially valuable in that it brings together the unequivocal statements of the great non-Roman Councils from that at Jerusalem in 1928 on through Madras, Malvern, Delaware, and Cleveland.

Reading that chapter, one is aware that the church is moving to the abolition of racial segregation. All those great gatherings pronounced that segregation because of race or color is a sin. For example, at Cleveland, January, 1945: "We believe that religious liberty is basic to all human rights and that it should be accompanied by equal and unsegregated opportunity for all races," and "Race prejudice is a primary obstacle to world brotherhood. It is strongly urged upon churches and church members that they wage a continuing campaign against race prejudice in all its forms."

These are more than pious resolutions. Local church bodies and local churches are beginning to act. Interracial churches are springing up. The Church Federation of Greater Chicago is out to destroy Restrictive Covenants. No Christian can support these covenants.

I was much interested in his section, "The Boomerang of Missions." The last century witnessed the greatest missionary movement in all history, "an outpouring of lives and of wealth to stagger the imagination" and then comes the pay-off:

> The missionary carries a gospel of inclusive brotherhood. When his converts begin to take that gospel seriously, he is greatly embarrassed unless he is ready to practice what he preaches. And if the missionary begins to practice the inclusive brotherhood, he embarrasses the people in the churches back home. They sent him out to preach the gospel; but did they expect that they would be called on to practice what he preached?

No Christian can afford to miss this book. It is a must for 1946.

JAMES M. YARD.

Correspondence

Resolutions Are Not Enough

To UNITY:

A new organization working for world peace, the Women's International Democratic Federation, is described by Lydia G. Wentworth in the July UNITY, as having a membership of eighty-one million members, in forty-one countries. This reminds me that Florence Boeckel in her book, *Between War and Peace,* published in 1928, lists twenty-one national and international organizations of women which have repeatedly passed resolutions denouncing war. These resolutions have been supplemented by similar ones passed by church organizations and by the Federal Council of Churches. However, all these resolutions, representing good intentions, have proved but so much water passing under the bridge, and utterly ineffectual in warding off a war of extent and destruction unrivalled in the world before. Mrs. Boeckel quotes statements from the words of many prominent men, among them Winston Churchill, warning of the horrors of a second World War, which were as ineffectual as a summer breeze against the force of the atomic bomb, climaxed by the burning of helpless women and children on the fiery altar of Baal, "in the defense of civilization and Christianity."

Resolutions have proved a hollow mockery and a meaningless phrase, and Miss Wentworth calls for direct action to bring about a lasting peace. Direct action is surely needed, and to me it seems that the most telling work in this direction is that of the conscientious objectors, the young men who suffered ignominy and imprisonment for their faith. I call attention to the record of Jehovah's Witnesses—those pestiferous folks who go from door to door trying to sell their religion, but who sent more men into prison camps for conscientious objectors than any other denomination. They stood firm and suffered for their faith, along with Quakers, Methodists, and representatives of other demoninations, and even some of no religion at all, to speak of. Many of these are still in prison, I believe.

May these men not prove the fulcrum supporting the lever to roll away the stone of pride and prejudice and release the new, but ever old, spirit of understanding and justice, the spirit that Jesus had, for the salvation of a dying world? We certainly need a wide view, and I am Humanist enough to believe, with Victor Yarros, that moral principles are evolved from knowledge gained by human experience. Emerson said, and his spirit still says: "Persuasion is in the soul, but necessity is in the intellect." I cannot forget those two famous Humanists of the Old Testament, Abraham and Moses, who when they knew their Lord was going too far in the matter of revenge, dared to argue with Him, face to face, the first telling Him it was not like Him to destroy the innocent with the guilty, in the case of Sodom; and Moses, revolted by the slaughter of those who had bowed down to the golden calf, saying to the Almighty that if He would not forgive their sin, "blot my name out of thy book that thou hast written."

Emerson also says that our actions are our best prayers, and Isaiah, believing himself the mouthpiece of the Lord, says that incense is an abomination to him, the new moons, and the Sabbaths, even the solemn meeting, and warns us to cease to do evil and learn to do well, "seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, let us reason together."

At a recent W. C. T. U. institute in our town, a leading woman declared we must go to church more and pray more if we would save the world. The real interest in the meeting seemed to center in the luncheon, and the reports said that "delicious refreshments were served."

Some years ago when a fire broke out in our little town, which had no fire protection, a girl, hastening along with her bucket of water to the fire, was met by a devoted church woman, who asked her to join in getting down on her knees on the pavement and praying. "Madam, this is no time for prayer, but for work," replied the girl and hurried on with her bucket.

I do not think women are so much more pacific than men, for if so what has become of the great influence for good that women are said to have and which we used to hear so much about? Why did they not teach their children, if their husbands could not be taught, to cultivate the spirit of peace instead of that of strife? I think human nature is much the same, regardless of sex.

I have just received an announcement of the fact that the Fellowship of Reconciliation, to which I belong, has a membership of fifteen thousand in the United States, "and if this could be raised to 150,000 determined and concerned members, they would be a great inspiration and support to the little groups of pacifists who have come out of great tribulation." Let us hope that the result will be more effective than resolutions to outlaw war.

MAY STRANATHAN.

Cumberland, Ohio.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

REMEMBER THE PREACHER

"Members of a small congregation in Iowa, prospering through the lush market for farm products as well as city goods, suddenly awoke to the fact their pastor was on a slim diet. His salary had remained static while prices soared.

"They promptly showed the Christian spirit by not only voting him a substantial raise but making it retroactive for two full years. They presented him with a check for $2,000.

"Laborers in the vineyard do not and should not expect to become rich, but they should be able to support themselves and their families in decency and comfort. They and their flocks benefit alike if they are able to concentrate on more spiritual things than making ends meet.

"This Iowa congregation of only 150 members has set an example that should be more widely followed and undoubtedly would receive the blessing of the harassed clergy."

(Reprinted by permission from the *Chicago Daily News*, September 16, 1946.)

The Board of Directors of the American Unitarian Association on October 9th empowered the President to "reactivate the Committee on Ministerial Salaries to review the present conditions and make recommendations as to the necessity for increases in ministers' salaries."

A recent news item in a Chicago paper stated that food costs were up 88 per cent over 1939; other necessity costs have gone up almost proportionately. We would recommend that each church ask itself whether it has been fair with its minister in regard to his salary.

BLOOMINGTON WORKSHOP

A Churchmanship Workshop to be held at Bloomington, Illinois, Saturday and Sunday, November 23rd and 24th, is of major importance. It is hoped that those churches in the eastern half of the Conference which have received invitations will make sure that they are well represented. This is a workshop for laymen and lay women who are interested in the welfare of their local church. The four sections of the workshop and their leaders are:

Membership—Mrs. Mark Pangborn of Indianapolis.

Finance—Rev. Lon Ray Call of Boston.

Organization and Administration—Rev. Kenneth C. Walker of Bloomington.

Public Relations—Waldo C. Fechner of St. Louis.

General Chairman—Mrs. Florence Fifer Bohrer of Bloomington.

NEW NOTES

The Ann Arbor church dedicated their new church house Sunday, October 27th. Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman of Boston gave the sermon. Rev. Randall S. Hilton gave the greetings of the Conference and of the Association and the dedicatory prayer . . . Rev. Robert Murray Pratt has resigned at Quincy to accept the ministry of the Community Church on Santa Catalina Island. He began his work there November 1st . . . Sioux City has called the Rev. John W. Brigham of Billerica, Massachusetts, to be their minister. They entertained the Iowa Unitarian Association October 21-23 . . . Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark of St. Louis gave the Judy Foundation lecture at the Iowa Association October 21st . . . The Minnesota Conference met October 17-18 at Ihduhapi Camp on Lake Independence, Minnesota. Among the speakers were Rev. Ernest Kuebler and Dr. Leslie T. Pennington . . . Rev. Leon Rosser Land was installed as minister at Flint, Michigan, November 7th. Dr. John Haynes Holmes of New York gave the sermon. Mr. Hilton gave the charge to the congregation and the installation prayer . . . Dr. Charles E. Snyder was twice honored during the month of October. On October 4th at the annual meeting of the Davenport church he was given a testimonial and token of esteem for his fifteen years as minister to the church. On October 22nd at the Iowa Association banquet a similar expression of esteem and appreciation was accorded him on his retirement from thirty years of service as Secretary of the Iowa Unitarian Association . . . Rev. Grant Butler of Des Moines was elected Secretary of the Iowa Association. Rev. Waldemar Argow of Cedar Rapids was elected Vice-President. Mr. Roman Hruska of Omaha is President. The Treasurer is Mr. Franklin Brown of Des Moines . . . Rev. John Cyrus, Omaha, has been elected editor of the Unitarian Ministerial Union's *Newsletter* by the Executive Committee of the Union. He succeeds Mr. Hilton in this capacity. The Chicago Ministers Club will hold regular meetings the third Monday of each month beginning November 18th. Western Conference ministers who may be in Chicago on those dates are cordially invited to attend. Meetings are held at 3:00 p.m. in the Curtis Room at Meadville.

FROM EDWIN C. PALMER

Do Men Gather Grapes of Thorns?

They said, "He was a good man,
Too bad he was an unbeliever."
An Unbeliever!
Forty years he taught our youth:
Fathers, sons and even grandfathers.
Forty years invested in human lives—
by an unbeliever!
Math and science were the means
By which he whetted our appetites for knowledge
And lifted our horizons.
His words echoed his life when he said,
"Life, in the main, is good—and where it isn't
Intelligent men can make it better."
Those who cherished little sins
Were disturbed when he quoted:
"The only sin is ignorance."
Forty years he plowed and planted youthful minds;
The harvest—only a promise—for future
gathering.
And they said, ". . .
Too bad he was an unbeliever."

Churchmanship Workshop—Bloomington, Illinois.
November 23-24, 1946.